

SENATOR TED CRUZ
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary

Questions for the Record for David Arkush, Witness at the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Hearing Entitled *Enter the Dragon—China and the Left’s Lawfare Against American Energy Dominance*

I. Directions

Please provide a wholly contained answer to each question. A question’s answer should not cross-reference answers provided in other questions. Because a previous witness declined to provide any response to discrete subparts of previous questions, they are listed here separately, even when one continues or expands upon the topic in the immediately previous question or relies on facts or context previously provided.

If a question asks for a yes or no answer, please provide a yes or no answer first and then provide subsequent explanation. If the answer to a yes or no question is sometimes yes and sometimes no, please state such first and then describe the circumstances giving rise to each answer.

If a question asks for a choice between two options, please begin by stating which option applies, or both, or neither, followed by any subsequent explanation.

If you disagree with the premise of a question, please answer the question as-written and then articulate both the premise about which you disagree and the basis for that disagreement.

If you lack a basis for knowing the answer to a question, please first describe what efforts you have taken to ascertain an answer to the question and then provide your tentative answer as a consequence of its reasonable investigation. If even a tentative answer is impossible at this time, please state why such an answer is impossible and what efforts you intend to take to provide an answer in the future. Please further give an estimate as to when the Committee will receive that answer.

To the extent that an answer depends on an ambiguity in the question asked, please state the ambiguity you perceive in the question, and provide multiple answers which articulate each possible reasonable interpretation of the question in light of the ambiguity.

NOTE: Just before opening this document to review the questions and begin to type answers, I saw breaking news regarding unprecedented, climate-related flooding that has killed at least 27 children in Texas, while rescuers search for dozens more who are still missing.

For a moment, set aside your objections to prosecuting fossil fuel companies for criminal misconduct. Regardless of whether anyone is investigated or prosecuted, it is obvious that climate change is killing people, including people you represent in Texas. It is also well established—as oil majors admit under oath in court—that global warming is caused primarily by burning fossil fuels. Moreover, the industry’s own internal documents reveal that they predicted many current climate harms several decades ago, and we now know that their predictions were startlingly accurate. I say this not to make a point about culpability, but as additional evidence that the rampant, unnecessary burning of fossil fuels is causing mass harm. The industry knows it, and you must know it.

Oil majors would claim that the harm is justified by the benefits of their products. But if they believed that—and if they believed consumers and the public would freely agree with them—then they wouldn’t have spent the last several decades lying about climate science and climate solutions. What’s actually going on is that the industry has a reality problem: We can replace most of their products with energy sources that are better in nearly every way—cheaper, cleaner, more reliable, and safer. The demand is for *energy*, not energy from any particular source. Fossil fuel firms could have chosen to produce energy from other sources. They still can. But the newer sources of energy, while profitable, have been less lucrative than fossil fuels, and the industry would prefer to make a higher return on investment. That, ultimately, is the crux of the problem: A powerful, unaccountable industry wants to keep making extra money as long as possible, and we need to require it to act more responsibly.

I continue to invite you and your staff to serve your Texas constituents and our nation by working to solve the grave problem of rampant, unnecessary fossil fuel use rather than perpetuating it. As a Texas Republican, you are well-positioned to make a positive difference—more so than most public officials in the United States. You could be a hero.

Please consider it. I would be happy to discuss the matter with you further.

II. Questions on “Climate Homicide”

In your 2024 Harvard Environmental Law Review article,¹ you advocate for creation of a crime of “climate homicide” to be asserted against the traditional energy industry, an essential driver of modern life. You reiterated your support for this theory during the hearing, telling Senator Cruz you believe energy industry executives should be jailed.

1. At the hearing, you testified under oath that the fossil fuel industry “kills millions of people every year” and endangers “humanity’s survival.” Given those sentiments, and your proposal that the manufacture and sale of fossil fuel resources should constitute a criminal act of homicide, do you believe that the government should categorically prohibit the manufacture and sale of fossil fuels in order to save, as you contend, “millions of people every year”? If not, why?

No. I believe we should do everything in our power to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to safe levels as rapidly as possible. Most current fossil fuel use is unnecessary and can readily be reduced or eliminated through a combination of energy efficiency, renewables, storage, and transmission. Taking these steps will not only combat climate change, but create millions of jobs and provide vastly cheaper, more reliable and abundant energy, while reducing myriad health harms from burning fossil fuels.

I also believe fossil fuel companies and public officials who care about the well-being of Americans, the health of the American economy, and the success of America as a nation should assist this effort rather than fight it.

I would also like to correct a few mistakes in the question above. It states that I told Senator Cruz that I “believe energy industry executives should be jailed.” That was Senator Cruz’s characterization. In the hearing, I stated, “it could be the case that some executives should be prosecuted.”

The question also states that I “advocate for creation of a new crime of ‘climate homicide’” in my *Climate Homicide* article. But the article does not advocate for the creation of a new crime. Rather, it argues for the application of standard homicide doctrine to a course of conduct to which it has not been applied yet—the reckless, if not knowing, killing of millions of humans by fossil fuel companies who have defrauded consumers and the public about the dangers of their products and the viability of

¹ See David Arkush et al., *Climate Homicide: Prosecuting Big Oil For Climate Deaths*, 48 HARVARD ENV. L. REV. 45 (2024).

alternatives so they can profit financially despite knowing that excessive use of their products would cause, in the industry's own words, "globally catastrophic" harm.

By including the phrase "you testified under oath," the question may be read to cast doubt on the veracity of the claims that (1) the fossil fuel industry kills millions of people every year; and (2) excessive burning of fossil fuels threatens humanity's survival. The first is flatly true. For one, air pollution largely attributable to burning fossil fuels is responsible for 1 in 5 deaths globally, or many millions of deaths every year.² The second statement is from an internal American Petroleum Institute document from 1982.³ It is also obvious that humanity could disrupt the global climate so much that we cannot be certain we would survive. The 1982 API document states that we could reach that point at 4°C of warming, which remains a reasonable conjecture.

2. The fossil fuel energy sector is heavily regulated at both federal and state levels. How do you bridge the gap between calling for criminalization of the energy industry's supply of fossil fuels to end users, even while the government - including with the voices of some of the most prominent politicians in the Democratic Party - otherwise permits, regulates, and overtly encourages⁴ the conduct you contend to be criminal?

There is no contradiction between an activity being harmful and being regulated. Whether something is "heavily" regulated is in the eye of the beholder. I won't speak to that question here.

There is also no contradiction between conduct being legal in some circumstances and being criminal, even homicidal, in others. I can legally offer a child a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. But if I know the child has a severe peanut allergy, and the child dies from eating the sandwich, then my conduct may constitute homicide.

I also testified that the fossil fuel industry has been fraudulently lying for decades about climate harms and solutions. For this reason, its conduct has *not* been lawful.

² See, e.g., Anna Miller, *Fossil Fuel Air Pollution Responsible for 1 in 5 Deaths Worldwide*, Harvard School of Public Health, Feb. 9, 2011, <https://hsph.harvard.edu/climate-health-c-change/news/fossil-fuel-air-pollution-responsible-for-1-in-5-deaths-worldwide/>.

³ See Alan Oppenheis & William I. Donn, *Climate Models and CO2 Warming*, LAMONT-DOHERTY GEOPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 4–5 (Mar. 16, 1982).

⁴ See, e.g., Josh Boak, *Biden Calls for More Production and Lower Profits in Letter to U.S. Oil Refiners*, PBS NEWS (June 15, 2022), <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/biden-calls-for-more-production-and-lower-profits-in-letter-to-u-s-oil-refiners>; Reuters, *California Governor Seeks Help for Struggling Oil Refiners*, REUTERS (Apr. 23, 2025), <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/climate-energy/california-governor-seeks-help-struggling-oil-refiners-2025-04-23/>.

Moreover, the industry has, through its fraud, corrupted much of the market and regulatory infrastructure in which it now operates. In other words, even if its conduct were legal, it obtained the current legal regime and market circumstances in part by defrauding the public and policymakers, rendering ineffective any resort to claims of lawfulness.

3. How much fossil fuel, if any, may the U.S. energy industry provide to satisfy business, consumer, and even government demand before doing so rises to the level of criminal misconduct?

It may depend on which crime we are discussing. But the industry certainly would not be liable for crimes against persons if it were to sell only a safe amount of its products. Again, the vast bulk of demand is for energy, not any energy from any particular source—and certainly not energy produced and used in ways that destroy humanity’s only habitat.

4. Given that the U.S. Department of Defense is the largest single purchaser of fossil fuels in the United States, do you propose (apart from any consideration of sovereign immunity) that the Department of Defense, and those who operate within and lead it, should be subject to criminal sanctions for climate homicide? If not, why not?

The U.S. Department of Defense, at least when run by individuals committed more to securing America than serving any particular ideology, industry, or leader, recognizes that fossil fuel supply issues pose major logistical and operational challenges in combat scenarios, and it is therefore working to reduce its need for fossil fuels.

The Department of Defense has also made clear that climate change is a severe threat multiplier, in part because it foments violence and creates desperate populations seeking to migrate. In other words, the military recognizes that climate change causes injuries and deaths, and it obviously supports reductions in the threats posed and exacerbated by burning fossil fuels.

Finally, we should all recognize that the need to secure access to fossil fuels drives an enormous amount of U.S. foreign policy and military conflict—nearly all of which would be obviated by transitioning the U.S. economy to cheaper, more stable sources of energy, like renewables.

5. In the Sixth Assessment Report (the “AR6”) issued by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”), the IPCC expressly states that “[s]cientists cannot answer directly whether a particular event was caused by climate change, as extremes do occur naturally, and any specific weather and climate event is the

result of a complex mix of human and natural factors.”⁵ Given that even the IPCC is unable to identify a causal relationship between any given weather event and climate change, much less the purported causes of climate change (such as anthropogenic emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels), on what basis do you conclude that prosecution for “climate homicide” could ever meet the required burden of proof for “guilt beyond a reasonable doubt”? Do you contend that the burden of proof for “climate homicide” should be reduced to a lower standard to facilitate prosecutors’ ability to secure a conviction?

The quoted statement about causation is, at a minimum, outdated. IPCC reports are always behind the times. They review past science and, on top of that, take years to produce. Further, the IPCC report quoted here is four years old. In addition, IPCC reports can be watered down by nations with a strong interest in continuing to produce and sell fossil fuels.

A rapidly developing branch of climate science called attribution science has made tremendous progress in recent years in analyzing whether particular extreme weather events can be attributed to climate change. In some instances, the evidence is extremely strong.

III. Questions on Personal Carbon Footprint; Users Versus Suppliers

During the hearing, you were asked whether individuals with large carbon footprints, like prominent politicians who heavily utilize private jets (e.g., John Kerry), should also face prosecution under your theory. You declined to extend culpability to these individuals, and you also excused your own contribution to climate change.

1. New York University Law School recently published an entire issue brief entitled “The U.S. Power Sector’s Annual Climate Pollution Causes Thousands of Deaths and Massive Economic Damage.”⁶ Do you believe that the crime of “climate homicide,” for which you advocate, should apply to the power generation sector in the United States? To other industries that are alleged to be contributors to climate change?

⁵ CLIMATE CHANGE 2021: THE PHYSICAL SCIENCE BASIS, INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE 1611, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_FullReport.pdf.

⁶ Howard & Schwartz, *The Scale of Significance: Power Plants*, INST. FOR POL’Y INTEGRITY, N.Y. UNIV. SCH. OF L. (May 30, 2025) <https://policyintegrity.org/publications/detail/the-scale-of-significance-power-plants>.

It depends whether they meet the relevant legal standards. I haven't looked closely at any other industry. I have started by focusing on the industry that is most responsible both for creating the problem and defrauding people over it for decades, while knowing that it would cause, in the industry's own words, "globally catastrophic harm" and more. Some utilities appear to have participated in defrauding the public about climate harms and solutions, along with the oil industry.

2. If you propose that your theory be limited to fossil-fuel providers alone, on what reasoned basis do you restrict criminal liability to those actors, versus others alleged to contribute to climate change?

I would not rule out the possibility that prosecutions might be merited in some other instances. It depends on whether an actor's or industry's conduct satisfies the elements of the offense—*i.e.*, whether they legally caused a given climate harm with a culpable mental state.

3. What other areas of criminal law, if any, categorically excuse from criminal liability the *users* of a criminal instrumentality, restricting criminal liability only to those who made that instrumentality available for criminal use?

The relevant question here, and in many criminal cases, is who substantially caused harm with a culpable mental state, not some distinction between users and suppliers.

But it is not uncommon in criminal law to punish a supplier more than a user, or vice versa—or one side not at all. Examples include illegal drugs and prostitution, with the former being some of the most prosecuted crimes. It is easy to hypothesize more instances in which we might enact criminal laws that differentiate in a similar manner.

One reason it is difficult to deflect blame from fossil fuel producers to fuel purchasers is that there is only one use for fossil fuels—the "globally catastrophic" one. The producers therefore cannot claim that they are innocent suppliers of a benign product that others have chosen to misuse. In this sense, the industry's sales are loosely analogous to those of illicit drugs, for which we commonly punish sellers much more than mere users.

Another reason why the fossil fuel industry is more culpable than its customers is that it has been deceiving them about the dangers of its products and the viability of alternatives for decades, as well as actively making it difficult for them to choose alternatives.

4. What legal basis, if any, supports exempting high-profile celebrities and politicians from prosecution under the same "climate homicide" culpability you propose for the energy industry? How do you respond to the argument that such exemptions undermine the fairness and applicability of your theory?

We discussed this at the hearing. I doubt any single individual's "carbon footprint" meets the criminal legal standard of substantially causing climate-related harms.

The fossil fuel industry comprises some of the largest, wealthiest, and most technically and scientifically adept corporations in the world. These companies have known for decades—for much, if not all, of that time, they have known better than nearly anyone else—that they were engaging in conduct that would cause "globally catastrophic" harm. They chose to defraud the public about this problem rather than work toward solutions and pursue safer lines of business. Collectively, the emissions from their products comprise a substantial proportion of all emissions since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution.

There is no comparison between their gross misconduct and the "carbon footprint" of any individual human.

Note that the very concept of a "carbon footprint" was invented by the industry—by British Petroleum, in 2004—to try to focus attention on individual consumer behavior and away from the industry's responsibility. Rather than meaningfully advance congressional knowledge, these questions just follow the industry's intended use of the concept.

5. Given that you testified that you used gasoline-powered transportation (Uber) to attend the hearing, what specific criteria would distinguish your own use of fossil fuels from the alleged culpability of the energy industry under your proposed theory of "climate homicide"?

We discussed this question at the hearing as well, and my answer to Question 4 above applies here.

There is more to say, however. Foremost, this line of questioning only demonstrates how deeply the fossil fuel industry, associated industries, and their political allies have structured our society to make it nearly impossible for ordinary people to avoid using fossil fuels. Far from implicating others in the industry's culpability, it only shows how much more culpable the industry is. To this day, the industry fights fuel economy standards, electric vehicle standards, electrification policies, renewable energy, and more. Senator Cruz recently voted for a bill that thwarts progress, innovation, and consumer choice in all these areas. In addition to locking people into buying more fossil fuels, that law gives more tax dollars in explicit subsidies to Big Oil, even though it is already one of the wealthiest and most powerful industries on Earth.

The question about my transportation was so predictable that I almost rode the Metro and walked a mile just so that I could say I did not use any fossil fuels when asked. But I was wearing a suit, it was nearly 100 degrees out—probably due to global warming from

fossil fuels—and there was a heavy thunderstorm almost immediately after the hearing. The only alternatives to a gas-powered car that Senator Cruz suggested were riding a bike or using “fairy dust.” He makes my point for me. Real alternatives to relying heavily on internal combustion engines exist, and they are excellent. But they are not readily available in ExxonMobil’s and Senator Cruz’s America.

My home is fossil free. You can bet that if it were realistic to travel fossil-free in all circumstances, I would do so. I invite Senator Cruz to help make it so instead of blocking progress toward better infrastructure and transportation.

IV. Questions on Threatening the Safety of Americans at Home and Abroad

Your organization, Public Citizen, has given prosecutors a blueprint for prosecuting “climate homicide” through the drafting and distribution of several preliminary prosecution memoranda. In one of those documents, Public Citizen wrote: “[i]ndeed, the authors hope this public memo can serve as a starting point for any prosecutor who wants to build a case to protect their constituents from the lethal climate disasters that are threatening public safety in communities across the country.”⁷

1. Do you advocate for the transition of scarce prosecutorial resources away from other law enforcement priorities to the prosecution of those allegedly responsible for “lethal climate disasters”? Do you believe that prosecutors should prioritize the prosecution of “climate homicide” over prosecution of violent crimes? If not, which crimes do you recommend prosecutors should deprioritize pursuing, so that they have sufficient resources to pursue “climate homicide” charges?

I have never advocated diverting prosecutorial resources. I believe prosecutors should have adequate resources to pursue all serious threats to the safety of their communities, including threats like climate change, which in some communities and years is responsible for significantly more death and destruction than violent crime.

2. Staunch advocates for decarbonization have observed that the U.S. Department of Defense is perhaps “the largest institutional user of petroleum . . . in the world.”⁸

⁷ REGUNBERG ET AL., CHARGING BIG OIL WITH CLIMATE HOMICIDE: PRELIMINARY PROSECUTION MEMO FOR JULY 2023 HEAT WAVE 1 (June 2024), <https://www.citizen.org/wp-content/uploads/Climate-Homicide-Prosecution-Memo-Final.pdf>.

⁸ See, e.g., Neta C. Crawford, *Pentagon Fuel Use, Climate Change, and the Costs of War*, BROWN UNIV. 2 (Nov. 13, 2019) <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/files/cow/imce/papers/Penta->

Do you agree that criminalization of the supply of fossil fuels in this nation would have a substantial impact on the ability of this nation to wage war? How does the nation meet its fundamental obligation to defend its interests at home and abroad, in a criminal law regime where suppliers of fuel are prosecuted, fined, and incarcerated for supplying these goods for military use?

I do not agree. The military and its suppliers are permitted to do many things, and to use equipment and resources, that are unlawful for ordinary businesses or citizens.

Note also that the military is rightly attempting to reduce its fossil fuel use, as freedom from the logistical and cost burdens associated with fossil fuel use would make it stronger and nimbler.

V. Questions on Finances; China

1. In your testimony, you opined on what you characterized as a dark money problem—people doing things they wouldn’t otherwise because they are getting paid. Senator Whitehouse in particular has expressed great consternation around the intrusion of money into policymaking. To what extent has any of your research or work, including your work on climate homicide, been funded or supported in any way by any of the following:

Senator Cruz raised the specter of dark money. The theme of the hearing was that the Chinese Communist Party is supposedly funding litigation against oil companies in the U.S.—a bizarre conspiracy theory for which the hearing failed to produce any evidence.

I merely pointed out that there is much more money on the side of fossil fuels than climate activists.

I also noted that one of the organizations Senator Cruz accused of brainwashing judges against oil has oil executives on its board and industry lawyers in leadership positions.

Rather than support the conspiracy theory, the hearing produced evidence against it. The oil industry’s influence is so broad and deep that, even when one attempts to craft a conspiracy theory about leftist climate activists undermining the industry on behalf of Chinese communists, one can scarcely help stumbling over industry-affiliated organizations (claiming nonsensically that they are brainwashing judges against their own board membership) and industry-generated concepts (like “carbon footprints”).

- a. Any entity associated with or funded by the Arabella network?

gon%20Fuel%20Use%2C%20Climate%20Change%20and%20the%20Costs%20of%20War%20Revised%20November%202019%20Crawford.pdf.

None.

- b. Any company, fund, organization, or person with commercial interests in so-called “green energy,” such as wind energy, solar energy, or electric vehicles, or which otherwise stands to benefit from any subsidies for “green energy” goods, services, or technologies?

None.

- c. Any company, fund, organization, or person based, in whole or in part, outside the United States or principally funded by sources outside the United States?

None.

- d. Any law firm pursuing any litigation seeking relief for harm allegedly associated with climate change?

None.

For each such answer above, please identify specifically the sources of support and the amounts received from each.

None. Can you say the same regarding support for your work and the fossil fuel industry? If you think funding sources matter, can you explain why they matter for other people and not for you?

Note also that pro-fossil-fuel organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Petroleum Institute, the Heritage Foundation, and the Republican Attorneys General Association have steadfastly refused to disclose their funders, and the oil majors refuse to disclose whom they fund. You should pressure all of them to be more transparent.

2. Please articulate (citing evidence) the specific basis for your assertion during the hearing that “ExxonMobil last year [earned] almost a billion dollars in profits a day, every day.”

I was repeating what Senator Whitehouse stated. After the hearing, I noticed that we both misspoke: ExxonMobil had almost \$1 billion in revenue each day last year, not profits. This information is readily available on the internet.

I was contrasting this single company’s revenue with the chart that Senator Cruz held up, which aggregated the revenue of several environmental groups. ExxonMobil alone receives in a single day roughly *double* the revenue of all the groups on Senator Cruz’s

chart combined, over whatever period the chart covered. I do not know the period, but I imagine it was at least a year, if not multiple years.

Revenue is in fact a better figure to use for this comparison than profit, as the chart showed the organizations' revenues, not the net of their revenues minus expenses.

3. At hearing, you held up the People's Republic of China as a benchmark for progress in so-called clean energy, remarking that "China is ahead of the U.S. right now in manufacturing some aspects of renewable energy, solar panels, batteries, critical minerals." You went on to say, "I don't know why they'd want to stay full of fossil fuels."

I said, "I don't know why they'd want to stifle fossil fuels"

I did not "hold up" the People's Republic of China as anything. I was paraphrasing my understanding of Senator Cruz's view and asked him to correct me if I was wrong. He did not correct me. If I recall correctly, he nodded in the affirmative.

- a. Do you agree that China is the single largest contributor, on a nation-by-nation basis, to greenhouse gas emissions on an annual basis?

I agree. I'm not sure what you're driving at, but other facts may also be relevant when considering Chinese and U.S. emissions:

- i. Although China is currently the global leader in producing new emissions, the U.S. has produced the largest amount cumulatively throughout history. Cumulative emissions are what matter most, and they stay present in the atmosphere for a very long time. At the same time, the situation is now so dire that any additional emissions are deeply problematic as well.
 - ii. China is a large purchaser of U.S. oil and gas.
 - iii. A nontrivial proportion of China's emissions stem from producing and shipping goods to other nations, including the U.S.
-
- b. A recent article notes that "China's construction of new coal-power plants reached [a] 10-year high" in 2024."⁹ Do you agree that China's aggressive expansion of its coal-fired power generation capacity is consistent with a status as an international leader in the fight against climate change?

⁹ Anika Patel, *China's Construction of New Coal-Power Plants 'Reached 10-Year High' in 2024*, CARBON BRIEF (Feb. 13, 2025) <https://www.carbonbrief.org/chinas-construction-of-new-coal-power-plants-reached-10-year-high-in-2024/>.

Although China is ahead of the U.S. on certain technologies, I would not call China a leader in the fight against climate change. I don't know who would. But it is certainly ahead when it comes to installing new solar and wind. In 2024 alone, it installed more than twice the amount of total U.S. utility-scale solar capacity.¹⁰

I believe Senator Cruz agrees that China is ahead of the U.S. on some energy technologies that will help solve the climate crisis. As I understand it, that was the premise of this hearing—that China wants to stifle U.S. fossil fuels so that we will be dependent on Chinese renewable technologies.

I said it would be better to invest in those technologies than defund them and coddle the industries of the past. Doing the latter is like surrendering the space race to the Soviets instead of committing to reach the moon before the end of the decade, as President Kennedy did in 1962. It is emphatically not how we make America great. When China is installing more than twice as much solar energy in a single year as we have total in the U.S., we're not winning. We're losing.

While I do not consider China a leader, I fear it may overtake U.S. leadership in several domains if our country continues to be mismanaged by politicians who give strong preference to costly, dirty, dangerous legacy industries at the expense of innovating and leading on the energy of the future—as well as support other harmful policies like cutting back health care; reducing food support for American children; attacking our world-leading research universities; defunding and demoralizing critical public servants and experts across the U.S. government; transferring wealth from the working poor to the idle rich; undermining democracy and the rule of law; and deterring lawful immigration that has long provided America with critical infusions of new labor, energy, and ideas.

¹⁰ U.S. Energy Information Administration, *China's Solar Capacity Installations Grew Rapidly in 2024*, Apr. 22, 2025, <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=65064>.